UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,980	03/30/2006	Kazuo Yoshida	03327.2344	4162
22852 7590 06/25/2008 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP			EXAMINER	
			SZEKELY, PETER A	
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1796	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/573,980	YOSHIDA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Peter Szekely	1796			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	l. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 Jul</u> This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This     Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4)  Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav  5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6)  Claim(s) 1-5,7,8,10-12 and 14-17 is/are rejected.  7)  Claim(s) 6,9 and 13 is/are objected to.  8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or  Application Papers  9)  The specification is objected to by the Examine.  10)  The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2006 is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the orecast.	vn from consideration.  rd. r election requirement. r. a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	2 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		• •			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/30/06, 12/17/07.	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal P 6)  Other:	te			

Art Unit: 1796

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 2. Claims 2 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 3. Since the polymer B1 in claim 1 is fully hydrogenated, the polymer B1 in claim 2, which depends from claim 1, cannot be partially hydrogenated. The phrase "pentaerythritol diphosphite derivative" renders claim 12 indefinite. Carbon dioxide is a derivative of pentaerythritol diphosphites. It is derived by burning. "Pentaerythritol diphosphite compounds" is acceptable.
- 4. Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 5. The term "large" in claims 16 and 17 is a relative term which renders the claims indefinite. The term "large" is not defined by the claims, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Numerical definition is required.

Art Unit: 1796

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 8. Claims 1-5, 7, 810, 11 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asahi Chemical JP-05-098147 or Asahi Chemical JP-05-339420, in view of Asahi Chemical JP-03-143953 or Katchman et al. 4,128,604.
- 9. Asahi Chemical ('147) discloses polyphenylene ether, HIPS containing high cis conjugated diene, polystyrene, block copolymer, pellets and molded articles. See Abstract and Examples. Asahi Chemicals ('420) teaches a PPE-polystyrene mixture blended with HIPS containing high cis butadiene and aromatic phosphates containing hydroxy groups and triphenyl phosphate in the Abstract. Asahi Chemical ('953) recites PPE, HIPS containing partially hydrogenated diene rubber and styrenic resin in the

Art Unit: 1796

Abstract. Katchman et al. reveal PPE and HIPS in claim 1, high 1, 4 cis content in claim 7, polyethylene, triphenyl phosphate and tridecyl phosphite in Examples 2-6. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to add the ingredients of the secondary references to the compounds of the primary references, since they are customary ingredients of impact resistant PPE compositions. Furthermore, the examiner holds that in the absence of unexpected results, the order of addition and pelletizing are obvious variations and all properties are inherent in the composition. The articles claimed in claims 16 and 17 are just large molding without any specific dimensions or properties and as such are also obvious.

## Allowable Subject Matter

- 10. Claims 6, 9 and 13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 11. Claim 12 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter Szekely whose telephone number is (571) 272-1124. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:10 a.m.-4:40 p.m. Tuesday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on (571) 272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1796

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Peter Szekely/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796

/P. S./ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796 6/18/08